

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 and 21-65 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-19 and 21-65 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 21, 36, and 51 have been amended. Support for this amendment can be found, at least, on page 5, lines 10-15.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-19 and 21-65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ogier, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0095504 (hereinafter referred to as “Ogier”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to amended claim 1, the cited art fails to anticipate, teach, or suggest “storing an address of said network element in a neighbor pending list, in response to receiving the first unreliable packet.” The Office Action mailed April 10, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as “Office Action”) cites paragraphs 42 and 227 of Ogier as teaching this feature of claim 1. Office Action, p. 2.

Paragraph 42 of Ogier describes how devices can each execute a neighbor discovery protocol. Paragraph 42 is completely silent with respect to any particular packet transmission, and thus this paragraph clearly does not teach or suggest anything at all about a receiving a first unreliable packet or storing an address in a neighbor pending list.

Paragraph 227 of Ogier describes how a node processes a HELLO message. In particular, if a node receives a complete HELLO message, the node creates an entry (if none already exists) for the sending node in a table. If the node receives an incomplete HELLO message, such an entry is not created. Ogier, FIG. 14 and para. 227. As noted throughout Ogier, HELLO messages are a type of message that the receiving node will acknowledge by sending a NEIGHBOR message. See, e.g., Ogier, para’s 68 and 196. As indicated by Applicant’s dependent claim 3, one type of reliable packet is a packet that requires a response. Accordingly, the complete HELLO message (which requires that a responsive NEIGHBOR message be sent) described in Ogier is a reliable message, not an unreliable message.

Thus, at best, the cited portions of Ogier teach creating an entry in a table for a neighboring node in response to receiving a complete HELLO message from that node. As noted above, the complete HELLO message is not an unreliable packet. Accordingly, the cited portions of Ogier do not teach or suggest “storing an address of said network element in a neighbor pending list, in response to receiving the first unreliable packet,” as recited in claim 1. For at least the foregoing reason, claim 1 is patentable over the cited art, as are dependent claims 2-15. Claims 21-65 are patentable over the cited art for similar reasons.

Additionally with respect to claim 1, Applicant notes that in the rejections, the Examiner appears to be equating the HELLO message described in Ogier with both the “first unreliable packet” and the “reliable packet” of claim 1. As noted above, the Examiner cites paragraph 196, which describes how HELLO messages are processed, as teaching the “first unreliable packet.” Similarly, the Examiner cites paragraph 231 of Ogier, which describes details of how the HELLO message is handled and what information should be included in subsequently sent HELLO messages, as teaching “sending a reliable packet.” Office Action, p. 3. Applicant respectfully submits that the HELLO messages described in those paragraphs cannot be both reliable packets and unreliable packets. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that claim 1 is not taught by the cited art for this additional reason.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogier in view of Saleh, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,856,627 B2 (Saleh). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to claim 16, the cited art fails to anticipate, teach, or suggest a network device wherein: “said central processing module is configured to store an address of said network element in said neighbor pending list while said network element is in a process of establishing said bi-directional connectivity with said system.” The Office Action cites paragraph 5 of Ogier as teaching this feature of claim 16. The cited paragraph recites:

In one aspect, the invention features a method for discovering a neighbor node in a network of nodes. A neighbor discovery message is received from a neighbor node. A predetermined number of neighbor discovery messages are periodically transmitted in response to the received neighbor discovery message. Each


neighbor discovery message includes an identity of the neighbor node. After transmitting the predetermined number of neighbor discovery messages, neighbor discovery messages that omit the identity of the neighbor node are transmitted until another neighbor discovery message is received from the neighbor node that indicates a change in a communications state associated with the neighbor node. Ogier, para. 5.

The above-quoted paragraph makes no mention of a neighbor pending list at all. Furthermore, the above-quoted paragraph does not talk about storing an address of a network element in a pending list within the network device itself. Instead, the cited portion of Ogier simply notes that a node's identity can be included within a neighbor discovery message that is being sent between nodes. Accordingly, the cited art does not teach or suggest storing the address of a network element in a pending neighbor list that it itself included within a network device, as recited in claim 1. No other portion of the art has been cited as teaching or suggesting a neighbor pending list that stores the network address of a network element while that network element is in the process of establishing bi-directional connectivity with the network device. For at least this reason, claim 16 is patentable over the cited art, as are dependent claims 17-19.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5087.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 10, 2006.


Attorney for Applicants

7/10/2006
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Brenna A. Brock
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,509
Telephone: (512) 439-5087
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099